



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,538	03/17/2004	Brian Labrec	P0952D	5669
23735 7590 03/20/2008 DIGIMARC CORPORATION 9405 SW GEMINI DRIVE BEAVERTON, OR 97008				
EXAMINER				
NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/20/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,538

Applicant(s)

LABREC, BRIAN

Examiner

Patrick D. Niland

Art Unit

1796

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2007 and 30 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/888)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/21/07 and 11/30/07 has been entered.

The amendments of 11/30/07 have been entered. Claims 1-15 and 26 are pending.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned

with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-15 and 26 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 and 9-10 of copending Application No. 10/677,092. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the explanation given in paragraph 4 of the office action mailed 12/8/06 which is incorporated here by reference. It is not seen that the method steps of composition claim 26 distinguish the composition of the copending claims from that of claim 26 of the instant application. Since the additives of the copending claims and the instant claims appear to be used for the same purposes, it is expected that they must be used in the same amounts. No unexpected results are seen for the instantly claimed amounts in a manner commensurate in scope with the instant claims and the cited prior art.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. It is noted that the copending claims have been allowed but not yet issued in a patent.

Applicants state that they are going to defer response on the above double patenting rejection until issuance of at least one of the applications involved.

It is noted that until such issuance, the above rejection is maintained against the present claims.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the disclosed “second laser enhancing additives”, does not reasonably provide enablement for all of the encompassed laser enhancing additives. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

A. The scope of the claims read on all potential “second laser enhancing additive[s]” including those not disclosed by the enabling specification. Therefore the claims encompass all possible “second laser enhancing additive[s]”. The instantly claimed “second laser enhancing additive[s]” reads on an infinite number of compounds. In re Wands has 8 criteria, (MPEP 2164.01(a)), as shown below.

(A)The breadth of the claims;

(B)The nature of the invention;

(C)The state of the prior art;

(D)The level of one of ordinary skill;

(E)The level of predictability in the art;

(F)The amount of direction provided by the inventor;

(G)The existence of working examples; and

(H)The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

It is noted that the instant claims read on all potential “second laser enhancing additive[s]” which encompasses an infinite number of compounds (Wands factor A). The specification does not

describe how to make all such “second laser enhancing additive[s]”, how to add them to the claimed compounds, nor how to select those “second laser enhancing additive[s]” from the infinite list thereof which will function as required in the instant invention (Wands factors F, G). It would require an infinite amount of experimentation to determine how to make all of the “second laser enhancing additive[s]” encompassed by the instant claims and another infinite amount of experimentation to determine which of these “second laser enhancing additive[s]” would function in the instantly claimed invention as required (Wands factor H). Chemistry is an unpredictable art (Wands factor E). The ordinary skilled artisan has not imagined nor figured out how to make all of the “second laser enhancing additive[s]” encompassed by the instant claim of “second laser enhancing additive[s]” yet (Wands factors C, D, E, F, G, and H). The enabling disclosure is not commensurate with the full scope of the claimed “second laser enhancing additive[s]”.

5. Claims 4-6, 8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. It is unclear if the weight percentages of claims 4-6 and 10 are based on all of the recited components in the compositions, all of the components in the composition, including those encompassed by “comprising”, or some portion of the compositions such as the first and second laser enhancing additives only.

B. It is unclear what the scope of “whitish polycarbonate” of claim 8 is. It is unclear what the scope of “substantially white polycarbonate” is. It is particularly unclear how white the polycarbonates need to be, or non-white as the case may be, to fall within the scope of these

terms or to be excluded from these terms. They seem to be relative in nature. The terms are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

C. It is unclear what is intended by the abbreviations "PET-G" and "PET-F" of claim 8. It is unclear what is required by "POM" of claim 8. It is unclear what is required by ABS/PC of claim 8.

D. It is unclear what is intended by "vinyls" of claim 15. Is it intended to encompass monomers and polymers of vinyl monomers or only vinyl polymers?

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of US Pat. No. 5840142 Stevenson et al., US Pat. No. 5374675 Plachetta et al., and US Pat. No. 5075195 Babler et al..

The cited prior art is all directed to marking polymer compositions with high energy sources though Stevenson does not disclose laser marking. The prior art is seen as being analogous therefore.

Stevenson discloses the instantly claimed compositions containing the instantly claimed polymers and pigments including barium or cadmium sulfides (column 3, lines 6-8) except that they do not contain the instantly claimed copper potassium iodide nor copper iodide.

Plachetta discloses laser inscribable compositions of the instantly claimed polymers, copper iodides (column 3, lines 60-61), and pigments (column 3, lines 32-54), which fall within the scope of the instantly claimed compound of claim 7 of the instant application due to the affect of said pigments on light by definition of pigment, but no metal sulfides. The compounds of column 3, lines 32-56 are all expected to fall within the scope of the instant claim 7 also since some enhanced property is expected from each additive or it probably would not be used.

Babler discloses laser marking compositions containing the instantly claimed polymers, molybdenum disulfide, pigments, and additives used in the plastics art, including additional colorants and antioxidants and heat stabilizers (column 4, lines 44-55), except that they do not contain the instantly claimed copper potassium iodide nor copper iodide.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instantly claimed invention to use the copper iodide of Plachetta with the compositions of Stevenson and/or Babler because the copper iodide would have been expected to give its antioxidant and/or heat stabilizing affects to the compositions of Stevenson and/or Babler and Stevenson and/or Babler encompass the use of such auxiliaries as stated above. The amount of Plachetta, column 3, lines 57-66 fall within the scope of the instant claims 1, 4-6, and 9-10. It is not seen that the processing steps of the instant claims give a different composition than that of the prior art discussed above. See MPEP 2112-2113. It is not seen that the above discussed polymeric compositions do not necessarily have the instantly claimed abilities of the instant claims 3, 11-

12, and 14-15 due to the polymers used therein. Column 4, lines 35-36 of Babler implies the step of the instant claim 13.

Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instantly claimed invention to use the metal sulfide pigments of Stevenson and/or Babler in the compositions of Plachetta because they are broadly encompassed by Plachetta's disclosure of using pigments and would have been expected to give their known pigmenting properties to the final compositions of Plachetta.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick D. Niland whose telephone number is 571-272-1121. The examiner can normally be reached on 4-10 M-R.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on 571-272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 1796

/Patrick D Niland/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796